

their schedules to accommodate this final week.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Finally, I remind everyone that today marks the eighth anniversary of the fatal shootings of Officer Chestnut and Detective Gibson as they protected the U.S. Capitol. At this time, I ask unanimous consent that at 3:40 this afternoon the Senate observe a moment of silence in recognition of these two fallen officers.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FRIST. Madam President, I will turn to the Democratic leader and then I have a very brief comment on the events today.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Democratic leader is recognized.

INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION

Mr. REID. Madam President, I didn't mention this in our private conversation, but we are going to do the Defense bill hopefully before we leave, and the one thing we haven't talked about is the Intelligence authorization bill. That has been reported out of the committee. I think we could have a very short time agreement—I mean very short. Is there a way the leader would try to work that into the schedule before we go? Because this would be the second year without an intelligence authorization bill.

Mr. FRIST. Let's consider that. I think over the next day or so we need to get together and go through all we do need to accomplish before we leave for that month for the August recess. Let's talk specifically about that bill as well.

Mr. REID. Yes.

REMEMBERING CAPITOL POLICE OFFICERS GIBSON AND CHESTNUT

Mr. FRIST. Madam President, 8 years—that is how long it has been since two Capitol police officers gave their lives in the line of duty. On July 24, 1998, a lone gunman entered this building, the Nation's Capitol. He was wearing a green fedora with extra bullets in his pocket when he opened fire. He shot two officers and a tourist before falling himself.

It is a day I will never forget. It is a day when I was swiftly driven back to my days in emergency medicine, emergency surgery, in the reality that even your best efforts cannot always save a life—because, despite our best efforts, we couldn't save Special Agent John Gibson or Officer Jacob J. Chestnut. It is a humbling experience, realizing the debt of gratitude we owe these two fallen heroes for their sacrifice and recognizing it can never be fully repaid. But

we can honor their sacrifice by remembering, by offering solemn tribute to their courage, and by protecting the memory of these heroes.

We must ensure that Special Agent Gibson and Officer Chestnut did not die in vain, and that the America they died protecting is the America we preserve today and in the future. I hope, I pray we are never faced with such tragedy again.

Thus, at 3:40 this afternoon, I hope this body will join me in a moment of silence, a moment to reflect on the courageous sacrifice of Special Agent Gibson and Officer Chestnut for, although 8 years have passed, their memory and their sacrifice is alive in these halls today.

I yield the floor.

THE WAR IN IRAQ

Mr. REID. Madam President, 1 month ago on June 22, the Senate held a debate about the raging and intractable war in Iraq. That debate, Democrats—led by Senators LEVIN and JACK REED—gave voice to the concerns of the American people and advocated that the Bush administration change course in Iraq.

We argued that the administration follow the law of the land. The law of the land is that the year 2006 will be a year of significant transition. That is the law. We argued that this year should be a year of transition, that we should follow the law with Iraqis taking charge of their own security and their own government so that American forces could be redeployed by the end of this year.

Our plan would have given the Iraqi people their best chance for success, while also giving America the best chance to confront the growing threats of North Korea, Iraq, and terrorism around the world.

Our plan would have engaged regional powers to help bring stability to Iraq and would have reminded the countries of the world of their commitment to invest in Iraq's long-term economic prosperity which seems to have been lost.

Our plan would have refocused America's military, diplomatic, and economic might on terrorist threats that face us in Iraq and globally, including Osama bin Laden, who remains free after 5 years.

Our plan would have tracked closely with the plan of our commanders on the ground in Iraq today, led namely by General Casey, who on their own have developed a similar strategy for success.

Despite that fact, the majority of the Republicans chose not to join the Democrats in serious debate about Iraq. I think they put their political needs ahead of America's security.

As they have in nearly every Iraq war debate, Republicans have blindly rubberstamped the President's mismanagement of this war and fell in line with his failed policy.

One month later, after the debate on Levin-Reid, the consequence of "staying the course" in Iraq is evident in every place.

In the last month in Iraq, more than 3,000 Iraqis have been killed—an average of 100 a day. And more than 100 were killed just yesterday.

Pick up any newspaper. Here is today's. "Bombings Kill at Least 66 in Iraq."

If you read the article, it is a lot more than 66. The intense violence made last week one of the deadliest in Iraq.

Read the article: 348 people killed, 6 of them police officers. Read the article: 34 dead. Read the article: 60 killed. Read the article: 24 civilians killed.

It doesn't talk about the hundreds and hundreds who have been wounded and injured, many of them for life.

This is a civil war. As I said last week, I tepidly talked about civil war. But I decided that there was no reason to be tepid about it—that there is a civil war going on in Iraq.

Take the New York Times from yesterday. There are lots of other places you could go to find the same thing. "It's Official: There Is Now a Civil War in Iraq."

This wasn't written by somebody who is just passing by deciding to write an op-ed piece and they stick the headline on. He is Nicholas Sambanis, a professor of political science at Yale, author of "Making War and Building Peace." He says, among other things:

The question of whether a country has fallen into civil war is often deliberately muddled for political reasons.

We have had some muddling here.

He goes on to say:

But if the term "civil war" seeks to convey the condition of a divided society engaged in destructive armed conflict, then Iraq sadly fits the bill.

The consequences of staying the course in Iraq is a full-blown civil war.

In the last month, nearly 3,000 additional Iraqis have been killed, 50 American soldiers have been killed, 250 have been wounded, \$13 billion of taxpayer money has been spent since that debate. The price of gasoline is now, as reported in this morning's news, the highest ever, averaging more than \$3 a gallon.

Staying the course, North Korea, on July 4, tested new long-range missiles.

In the last month, Hezbollah has terrorized Israel.

In the last month, al-Qaida found a new sanctuary, it appears, in large swaths of Somalia.

These are the costs of "staying the course" in Iraq and of a Senate which rubberstamps what the President does.

My question today is, how long will America be forced to pay these costs? The longer it takes for this Republican Congress to hold President Bush accountable for his mistakes, the less safe America becomes.

Democrats have asked for another Iraq debate before the August recess. I hope we have that opportunity because

the Republican leader said today that we are going to take up the Defense appropriations bill. I hope we would have an opportunity to do it there.

We want to give rubberstamping Republicans another chance to demand that President Bush change course in Iraq—not because of any political point scoring but because national security clearly demands it.

We live in a dangerous world, but nearly everywhere you look, from the Middle East to Asia, America's enemies have been emboldened by this administration's mismanagement of this conflict in Iraq. They are taking advantage of our damaged reputation in the world and the fact that Iraq has tied our hands to redouble their efforts and threaten us and our allies.

The Middle East has faced problems, as we know, for decades. Every American President since World War II has struggled to bring freedom, stability, and prosperity to this region. The President washed his hands of what was going on with the Palestinians and the Israelis until the Intifada became so complex, with so much conflict, that he had to step in. But that took years into his first term of office.

The war in Iraq has destabilized the Middle East and taken our attention and our resources away from other threats. That is without question. So far, the result of the Iraq war has been instability and no security. One of the biggest winners so far has been Iran. They continue to thumb their nose at our country. The war in Iraq has given it exactly what it wants: greater influence in Iraq and throughout the Middle East. The longer we go without a strategy for success in Iraq the stronger Iran gets and the more confident it is in supporting terrorist organizations like Hezbollah, which is now terrorizing Lebanon and Israel.

I believe Israel has every right to defend itself from these terrorist acts. While it defends itself, the United States should be standing by its side.

Unfortunately, because Iraq has tied our hands and exhausted our resources and our reputation, the Bush administration has had to sit on the sidelines. The President was ineffective in finding any solution during the G8 Summit, and he went nearly 2 weeks without dispatching his Secretary of State to the region. Finally, yesterday, Secretary of State Rice left for the Middle East. Hopefully her surprise visit to Lebanon is not a continuation of the Bush photo-op foreign policy. "Mission Accomplished," "Bring 'em On." I hope it is not a photo-op again but a serious effort to follow the call for American leadership.

The Bush administration's—as reported on the face of a major weekly magazine last week—cowboy diplomacy cannot be replaced by couch potato diplomacy where we sit and do nothing.

Democrats have called for a special envoy to emphasize the need for full-time leadership. We need to do the hard

work to put Iran back in the box and bring stability back to the Middle East. That job can be started but can't be finished by the Secretary of State during a brief visit there this week. What we need is a full-time special envoy—someone who can work around the clock with Egypt, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, the Europeans, and, yes, Russia and Israel.

Together, we can bring some good out of this terrible situation by finding ways to support the Lebanese Government, continue our support for Israel, and disarm Hezbollah and ultimately contain the Iranian power. The challenge will be for this administration and its Republican rubberstamp allies in Congress to step up and do the job. We need a new direction.

This week, the Iraqi Prime Minister will meet with President Bush and address a Joint Session of Congress here in Washington. When he is here, we need President Bush to communicate that our commitment in Iraq is not unlimited. He needs to announce a change of course in his failing policy.

If we hope to live in a world that is safe and secure, we must end the open-ended commitment in Iraq that is costing this Nation \$3 billion each week and requires the deployment as we speak of at least 125,000 of America's finest troops.

We must transition the mission in Iraq so that we can marshal our resources to the other threats America faces such as Bin Laden, who, as I said, remains free after 5 years, Iran, North Korea, and many other troubled spots in the world.

We must insure that the Senate is more than a rubberstamp for the executive branch. There are only 2 weeks before the August recess—really just 6 voting days left. There are a number of important subjects that deserve our attention but none more important than the intractable war in Iraq.

The Senate can no longer turn a blind eye to what is happening in Iraq. It is costing too many American lives, too many Iraqi lives, too many dollars, and too much of our national security.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, will the Democratic leader yield for a question?

Mr. REID. I would be happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. DURBIN. Last year, we had bipartisan agreement on the Senate floor, and the agreement was that this year, the year 2006, would be a year of significant transition in Iraq. We spelled out what we had in mind, that the Iraqis would take on more responsibility for their own fate and their own future, that the United States troops would be able to start withdrawing and coming home in this year of 2006. I ask the Democratic leader, as he joins with me each morning reading about how Iraq is descending into a civil war, the number of innocent civilians who are being killed in Iraq, and the number of American troops who continue to lose their lives in Iraq,

when we voted for significant transition in Iraq, is this what we had in mind?

Mr. REID. I say to my friend, this was on a bipartisan vote. On a bill co-sponsored by the two people who take care of our armed services, Senators LEVIN and WARNER, 79 Senators voted for that, and the law of the country as we speak is that the year 2006 is to be a year of significant transition in Iraq, and the President, I believe, should follow that law and he is not doing that. I agree with my friend.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask the Senator from Nevada if he would yield for this question. Then this year when the Defense authorization bill came forward, is it not true that the Democratic side offered another amendment in an attempt to strike a bipartisan position on foreign policy in Iraq, an amendment which was sponsored by Senator LEVIN of Michigan, Senator REED of Rhode Island, who is a graduate of West Point, served in the United States Army, and that this amendment which we offered to our friends on the Republican side to join us this year said we would start a transition this year before the end of the calendar year by re-deploying American troops outside of Iraq? This amendment we offered had 39 of 45 Democratic Senators supporting it and no Republican support.

I would ask the Senator from Nevada, at the end of that Defense authorization bill, just a few weeks ago, was any position taken by the Republican side of the aisle that suggested any change in policy in Iraq?

Mr. REID. I say to my friend, that is what is so concerning to me, that they are following—they, the Republican Senators, are following President Bush, stay the course, stay the course in Iraq. It breaks my heart, frankly. Every day I get up. This is just one page of the paper. I went through the deaths—hundreds of them. I didn't read here, but in the past week 1,000 people in Iraq have moved out; they are afraid. They move out of their neighborhoods. We have probably now estimated 200,000 people in Iraq since the first of the year have had to move their homes. They have no place to go. They want to try to stay alive. The turmoil, the civil strife in that country, is unbelievable, and to think that this country's policy is to stay the course is not sensible.

Mr. DURBIN. Again, if the Senator from Nevada will yield, as you watch the disintegration of the foreign policy under this administration, we find ourselves relying on the Chinese to try to negotiate some peaceful resolution in North Korea, we are relying on the Russians to try to find some way to approach the Iranians on their nuclear power, but we have no one to turn to when it comes to Iraq. This was our own creation, with British help and some other countries, but primarily American soldiers and American resources. I would ask the Senator from Nevada, is his point on the floor today

that the bipartisan Senate should not go home for the August recess without taking up this issue? We have spent weeks, the Republican leadership has spent weeks in the Senate on meaningless constitutional amendments and issues that bear little relevance to the daily lives of Americans, but the Senator from Nevada has to feel, as do I, we have an obligation to these soldiers and their families before we leave in August to have a meaningful debate on this floor about how to make certain that we end up in Iraq with our mission truly accomplished. I ask the Senator from Nevada, is that the purpose of his coming to the floor?

Mr. REID. First, my coming here is just as the Senator indicated. How can we, the Senate of our country, leave here with the raging civil war going on and our troops are right in the middle of it? How can we leave here without changing the course in Iraq? That is why I am here. It is a cry for help. We need our Republican colleagues to speak out. This blind allegiance to the President is not good for our country.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the Senator from Nevada for yielding for the questions.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Madam President, I ask permission to speak as if in morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate is in morning business.

Mr. BINGAMAN. I thank the Chair.

ENDING THE CRISIS IN ISRAEL AND LEBANON

Mr. BINGAMAN. I have come to the Senate floor today to discuss what I believe are some necessities, steps to bring an end to the current crisis in Israel and Lebanon and to set us back on a course toward stability in the Middle East.

I condemn the killing and the kidnapping of Israeli soldiers by Hamas and Hezbollah. I believe that was a deliberate act of provocation. It was intended to further rupture efforts at creating stability in the region, and it was carried out by groups who seek no less than the destruction of the nation of Israel. And I, I am sure along with my colleagues, support Israel's right to defend itself. However, I also believe the Israeli response has been excessive and the current crisis of escalating violence on both sides must be brought to an end so we can resume efforts at creating a lasting peace.

My first point is I believe United States interests and Israeli interests will be furthered if we support the efforts of the Secretary General of the United Nations to bring about a cease-fire at the earliest possible date. Secretary General Kofi Annan has called for an immediate end to fighting between Israel and Hezbollah. He has pointed out the obvious, which is that as long as fighting continues, the num-

ber of civilian deaths both in Israel and Lebanon will increase. I also believe this may be the best way to ensure the safe return of kidnapped soldiers. Of course, the further destruction of civilian infrastructure in Lebanon is putting the future economic and political viability of that nation at serious risk. I think it is obvious to all that what is occurring in Israel and Lebanon is a disaster for many innocent civilians.

Our own administration has chosen not to support Secretary General Annan's call for an end to hostilities. As I understand Ambassador Bolton's position, it is that allowing a continuation of hostilities will provide Israel the opportunity to eliminate Hezbollah's ability to attack Israel and that this degrading of Hezbollah's military capability will provide a better possibility for long-term peace. I support the goal of long-term peace, but I disagree with his view that continued combat is the best way to achieve it.

Whatever additional military advantage might be achieved by delaying a cease-fire comes at a very high cost. First, there is the cost in the loss of additional civilian lives.

Second, there is the additional support for Hezbollah in the Arab world which the continued attacks on Lebanon will almost certainly generate.

Third, there is the increase in anti-Israeli and anti-American sentiment throughout the Middle East and more broadly which will result if the military conflict continues.

While I understand the goal of these continued attacks is to bring an end to terror in the Middle East, and I strongly support that goal, I believe the result will be the opposite.

The administration's unwillingness to join other nations in calling for a cessation of hostilities reinforces the belief in Arab countries that our Middle East policy is based on a double standard. The perception is we have one level of concern when innocent Israeli civilians are being killed and injured and much less concern when the injured or killed civilians live in Arab countries. Support by the U.S. for an immediate cease-fire would save lives on both sides and would help to counter that perception.

There was an article in the Washington Post last week by Michael Abramowitz entitled "In Mideast Strife, Bush Sees a Step to Peace." In the article, he states:

In the administration's view, the new conflict is not just a crisis to be managed. It is also an opportunity to seriously degrade a big threat in the region, just as Bush believes he is doing in Iraq.

If this administration thinks it can succeed here in Lebanon with the same strategy that has brought us success in Iraq, then our foreign policy in Washington is even more out of touch with reality than I had thought.

My second point is as part of our effort to bring about this cease-fire, we need to talk directly with Syrians and others with whom we have disagreed.

Robert Malley, who was President Clinton's special assistant for Arab-Israeli affairs, has written an article in the July 24 issue of Time magazine making that case persuasively. His article is entitled "Time to Start Talking." The thrust of his argument is this administration's policy of not talking to those with whom we disagree has not served us well. The same argument is made by John McLaughlin, the former Deputy Director of the CIA, in yesterday's Washington Post.

In my view, both of these former officials are giving good advice and I urge the President and the Secretary of State to heed that advice.

My final point is this current crisis should be a wake-up call to this administration that the United States needs to reengage diplomatically in the region.

For the past several decades, United States administrations have seen our role in the Middle East as supporting the security of Israel but also as helping to resolve conflicts between Israel and its neighbors and supporting moderate governments in the region. There are many chapters in that history. Among the most remembered are Secretary of State Kissinger's efforts at shuttle diplomacy, President Carter's efforts at Camp David, President Clinton's efforts both in bringing Rabin and Arafat to the White House for a handshake, and his later efforts trying to broker a peace agreement at Camp David.

This current administration has chosen a different course. It has chosen to disengage from that conflict resolution role. As evidence of this, Secretary Powell did not appoint a special Middle East envoy as his predecessor had. Secretary Rice also has not appointed a special envoy. Her statement was:

Not every effort has to be an American effort. It is extremely important that the parties themselves are taking responsibility.

My strong view is this policy of disengagement has not served the interests of the United States, the interests of Israel, or the interests of other countries in the region. We are by far the biggest provider of aid to the countries in the Middle East and if any outside nation is to play an effective and a constructive role, it needs to be the United States.

I am glad the Secretary of State is in Beirut today, but progress on the diplomatic front cannot be postponed awaiting fly-ins by the Secretary of State. Secretary Rice should appoint a special envoy to work full time at resolving disputes and tensions in the region.

Again, John McLaughlin states the point well:

The chances of detecting and heading off imminent disaster are enhanced when there is intense, unrelenting and daily attention by a senior and respected U.S. figure who wakes up every morning worrying about nothing else—the role Dennis Ross played so effectively in the 1990s.

Continuing with his quotation.

Without constant tending to the concerns of all the regional parties, rapid flagging of